

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 15-24 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 10 is amended. The amendments introduce no new matter. Claim 14 is canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited in that claim. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 2, objects to claim 18 for an informality. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the conjunctive "or" should be replaced by "and." This assertion is incorrect for at least the following reasons.

Claim 18 recites the at least one client computer comprises at least one of a self-service kiosk, a terminal emulator, or a common language facility client computer. Where the intent is to encompass any one or more of an X, a Y and a Z, it is preferable not only to make it clear in the specification, but also to use the claim language "at least one of an X, a Y, or a Z." See *SuperGuide Corp. v. DirectTV Enterprises, Inc.*, 358 F.3d at 886-87 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (including n. 10); *Brown v. 3M*, 265 F.3d 1349, 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2001); MPEP §2173.05(h), Part II. As such, Applicant's use of the conjunctive "or" recited in claim 18 is proper. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 2, rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 10-14 and 16-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,185,857 to Rozmanith et al. (hereinafter "Rozmanith"). The Office Action, on page 6, rejects claims 3, 4, 6-9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozmanith in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,110 to Lection et al. (hereinafter "Lection"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action, on page 6, asserts that Rozmanith teaches a data network method and apparatus with features that allegedly correspond to the combination of all of the features recited in claim 1. This assertion is incorrect for at least the following reasons.

Rozmanith teaches a method and apparatus for rapid search and co-display of graphics and data for computer systems on a mobile station (Abstract). With reference to Figs. 4A and 4B, Rozmanith teaches that a passenger/seat side computer program generates header information that includes the configuration of the passenger/seat computer (col. 8, lines 35-46). The header and query information are transmitted to the on-board host computer 14 via transmission lines 39 (col. 8, lines 41-42). A host control program then determines the Application ID 42 and configuration of the seat computer 44 which transmits the data, enabling the on-board host to format the ultimate command so as to be compatible with the seat mounted system (col. 8, lines 58-63). The on-board host 14 processes the query 46 thereby identifying a plurality of data files responsive to the query criteria and transmits the data back to the passenger's computer system (col. 9, lines 5-13). Specifically, the host 14 processes database queries 46, tabulates the output and generates a compressed data packet to be returned to the passenger, which contains the number of records successfully received based on Host ID and Application ID (col. 10, lines 48-55).

Rozmanith does not teach, nor can it reasonably be considered to have suggested, defining at least one pattern expected to occur in the host response; detecting a match between the at least one expected pattern and the host response; and outputting data of the host response in a format based on the matched pattern to the client, as positively recited in claim 1.

For example, Rozmanith teaches a passenger seat program sending query data to a host which determines the configuration of the seat computer, thereby enabling the host computer to provide a preprocessed query answer associated with a database to answer the seat computer's query. Rozmanith does not disclose defining at least one pattern expected to occur in the host response. Rozmanith also does not disclose detecting a match between the at least one expected pattern and the host response. Further, Rozmanith does not disclose

outputting data of the host response in a format based on the matched pattern to the client.

With respect to each of the above-quoted features recited in claim 1, the Office Action cites to portions of Rozmanith that deal with pre-processed queries and answers for accessing relatively large databases in mobile networks. A close examination of each of these portions of cited text, however, reveals that Rozmanith does not disclose patterns expected to occur in any corresponding host response, matching or outputting data of the host response in a format based on the matched pattern. As discussed above, Rozmanith teaches host-client compatibility through the configuration of the Application ID and the seat computer thereby allowing data transmission to occur. As such, it is unreasonable to assert that Rozmanith anticipates at least the combination of all the features recited in claim 1.

The Office Action, on page 3, asserts that the Rozmanith apparatus and method teaches features that also allegedly correspond to the combination of all of the features recited in claim 5. Claim 5 recites features similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. For example, claim 5 recites, among other features, selecting a file containing at least one pattern expected to occur in the host response and detecting a match between the at least one expected pattern and the host response. In asserting that Rozmanith allegedly teaches these features, the Office Action cites to the same portions of text cited in the rejection of claim 1. As such, for at least the reasons discussed above, Rozmanith also fails to anticipate the combination of all of the features recited in claim 5.

The Office Action, on page 3, asserts that Rozmanith teaches a host computer 14 with features that allegedly correspond to the combination of all of the features recited in claims 10 and 14. Rozmanith teaches host computer 14 that receives incoming packet data, reads the data, and parses the data to determine the origin of the data, the configuration limitations of the seat site, the application being used and the data for the application (col. 10, lines 41-47).

The host computer then processes the data query and returns a compressed packet back to the passenger for parsing and display by the notebook PC 12 (col. 10, lines 48-61).

Rozmanith, however, does not teach, nor can it reasonably be considered to have suggested, a host response parser, which retrieves the data from the host responses by comparing the host response with an expected data pattern, and when the host response matches the data pattern, retrieves the data from the host response and formats the data according to the matched pattern, as positively recited in claim 14.

As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 5, Rozmanith does not disclose a host response parser that retrieves data with an expected data pattern, matching the data pattern or formatting data of the host response according to the matched pattern. Rozmanith teaches parsing the data to determine the origin of the data, the configuration limitations of the seat site, the application being used and the data for the application (col. 10, lines 41-47). As such, it is unreasonable to assert that Rozmanith anticipates the above-quoted feature recited in claim 10.

The Office Action, on page 7, concedes that Rozmanith does not teach a data pattern defined using extensible markup language, as positively recited in claim 6. To cure this deficiency, the Office Action asserts that Lektion teaches this feature. The Office Action concludes that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had the motivation to combine Rozmanith and Lektion to suggest the combinations of all of the features recited in claim 6. This assertion is incorrect for at least the following reason.

Claim 6 recites features similar to claims 1 and 5. Claim 6 recites, among other features, at least one data pattern defines a pattern expected to occur in a host response to a client. As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 5, Rozmanith does not disclose this feature. Lektion teaches a method and apparatus for representing host datastream screen image information using markup languages (Abstract). Lektion, however, does not teach, nor

can it reasonably be considered to have suggested, the above-quoted feature recited in claim 6. As such, it is unreasonable to assert that Rozmanith and Lektion, individually or in combination, can reasonably be considered to have suggested at least the combinations of all of the features recited in claim 6.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applied references cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features positively recited in independent claims 1, 5, 6 and 10. Additionally, claims 2-4, 7-9, 11-13 and 15-24 are also not taught, nor would they have been suggested, by the applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims, directly or indirectly, on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-13 and 15-24 under 35 U.S.C. §§102(b) and 103(a) as being anticipated by, or unpatentable over, the applied references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-13 and 15-24 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Pardini
Registration No. 30,411

Christopher J. Wheeler
Registration No. 60,738

TJP:CJW/clf

Date: August 8, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--